

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States fatent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS F.O. Box NSO Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usylio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/846,522	04/30/2001	Tomoyuki Nakano	112857-221	5535	
29175 RELL ROVID	7590 03/27/2007 .	EXAMINER			
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP P. O. BOX 1135			COLIN, CARL G		
CHICAGO, IL 60690			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2136		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/846,522	NAKANO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Carl Colin	2136	

·	Carl Colin	2136					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 13 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLÓWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date	=						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	` ,				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	at before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by see continuation sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:							

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the 112th rejection by deleting "in response to an additional authentication request sent from the information processing apparatus." However, the claims still recite the additional authentication request: "wherein the additional request is sent only if the decrypted result corresponds to the first data item." In addition, Examiner disagrees with Applicant's interpretation of "when the decryption result is successfully performed" to equate the decrypted result corresponds to the first data item. There is no disclosure of comparing the decrypted digital signature with digital signature previously received. On the other hand, this passage shows that by performing the decryption using the public key, the server 3 verifies the legitimacy of the user because the user is able to provide the digital signature encrypted by the private key of the key pair. Therefore, the 112th rejection has still not overcome. Applicant states that the claims have been amended to recite "for decryption and storage" and Audebert's IC card only provides security keys and not storing transaction data. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The IC card of Audebert also contains memory. It is well known that memory is used to store data and this limitation is an intended use and would still be an obvious modification over Audebert. The proposed amendment will not be entered because it raises new issues that would require further search and consideration.

> NASSER MOAZZAMI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

2